

Appln. No. 10/826,749  
Amendment dated February 15, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed November 15, 2007

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 24 remain in this application. No claims have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. Claim 25 has been added.

Claims 1 through 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of Tow.

Claim 1 requires, in part, "providing a deletion skipped scenes capacity to said user" and "deleting said plurality of scene segment records which contain information of a plurality of skipped scene segments stored on said hard disk upon reception of a user command".

In the rejection of the Office Action, it is asserted that the above requirements are disclosed by the Tow patent at col. 4, lines 52 through 58, where the Tow patent states (emphasis added):

In a fourth embodiment, a playback device is enabled to detect this editorial information or rating information and skip over or delete certain scenes or frames that have particular information or a rating. For example, a parent could program the system to play an R rated movie yet skip over all of the scenes that are R rated so that a PG movie is created for viewing by children.

Thus, this portion of the Tow patent discusses the skipping over or deletion of scenes based upon "editorial or rating information", and not the deletion of scene segment records based upon which scene segments are skipped. Instead, the Tow patent discusses a system in which scenes are skipped OR deleted based upon the associated "editorial or rating information", but does not discuss deletion in response to skipping by the user.

Furthermore, the "editorial or rating information" upon which scenes are skipped OR deleted in the Tow system is clearly not related to actions taken by the user with respect to the scenes. The Tow patent further discusses the nature of the "editorial or rating information" at col. 4, lines

Appln. No. 10/826,749  
Amendment dated February 15, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed November 15, 2007

29 through 51, which states (all emphasis added):

In a third embodiment, any video information can be viewed by a professional who adds editorial information to the video. For example, editorial information such as tone, emotion, level of violence, or a wide variety of other signified meta-data or editorial content may be presented. The information may include the number of people in a scene, language content, an "adult" rating, and place information. The information can be annotated to the video and then presented to the user in a navigation bar. All of these types of statistics from the video stream are added as annotations to the video file for later analysis by the viewer looking at a navigation bar. Advantageously, the annotations are transparent, take up a very few number of bytes, and are readable by the device rendering the video to the viewer. Further, those devices that do not recognize the annotations added to the video file can simply disregard the annotations without affecting presentation of the video. As an extension of this embodiment, movie rating information is annotated to each frame or scene in a video. In this embodiment, a rating is added to the video file for later presentation to a viewer. In this way a viewer can view a navigation bar and determine which type of scenes occur at different places in the video.

It is submitted that this description of the "editorial or rating information" shows that the "information" is not of the type that is supplied or indicated by the user (e.g., by skipping a scene), but instead is information that is supplied with the video and based upon the determination of a "professional" or by a movie rating commission. It is therefore submitted that Tow does not disclose "providing a deletion skipped scenes capacity to said user" and "deleting said plurality of scene segment records *which contain information of a plurality of skipped scene segments* stored on said hard disk upon reception of a user command".

Still further, it is submitted that Tow does not disclose the deletion of a plurality of skipped scene segments stored on said hard disk as the Tow patent merely discusses the "dropping" a scene from the playback of the video. More specifically, the Tow patent states at col. 14, lines 32 through 44 (emphasis added):

At 1105, a frame is acquired. At 1107, it is determined whether the frame should be removed based on the screening criteria. Using the

Appln. No. 10/826,749  
Amendment dated February 15, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed November 15, 2007

example above, if a screen contains R-rated content, the frame is dropped and it is determined at 1109 whether any frames are remaining. If frames remain, at 1113 another frame is acquired. Alternatively if the frame should not be removed because it is not an R-rated frame, the frames are forwarded to output at 1111. Output can be a display device such as a monitor or a TV screen. After the frame is forwarded to output at 1111, it is determined at 1109 whether any frames remain. If any frames remain, the next frame is acquired to determine whether the frame should be screened.

It is submitted that, as this discussion relates to the playback of frames of a video, and merely indicates that the screen is "dropped" and not deleted, that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the screen or frame is merely not displayed, rather than being deleted from a hard drive.

Further, the discussion at col. 4, lines 52 through 58 relates to the playback of the scenes or frames, and not to the storage of the scenes or frames, and therefore it is submitted to be more likely than not that the discussion relates to deletion from playback (as discussed above) and not deletion from storage.

It is believed to be significant that the only mention of "deleting" or "deletion" in the Tow patent is in the portion of the Tow patent at col. 4, lines 52 through 58 (quoted above), and that that reference to deletion is ambiguous as to whether the scene is actually deleted from storage or merely deleted from playback.,

Therefore, it is submitted that this portion of the Tow patent would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the requirements of claim 1, particularly the requirements of "providing a deletion skipped scenes capacity to said user" and "deleting said plurality of scene segment records which contain information of a plurality of skipped scene segments stored on said hard disk upon reception of a user command",

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Aoki and Tow set forth in the rejection of

Appln. No. 10/826,749  
Amendment dated February 15, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed November 15, 2007

the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 1, 8, 15 and 20. Further, claims 2 through 5, 6 and 7, which depend from claim 1, claim 5, which depends from claim 4, claims 9 through 11, 13 and 14, which depend from claim 8, claim 12, which depends from claim 11, claims 16, 17 and 19 which depend from claim 15, claim 18, which depends from claim 17, claims 21, 22 and 24, which depend from claim 20 and claim 23, which depends from claim 22 also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.


Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 24 is therefore respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: FEB 15, 2008

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)

Customer No. **40,158**

P.O. Box 5027

Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027

(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357